

Western District of New York have endorsed the naming of the courthouse in Jackson's honor. Chief Judge William Skretny called him "the most distinguished jurist and most acclaimed legal mind to come out of the Western District." And Senior Judge John Curtin said of Jackson, "I think we should pick someone from the court family in western New York. I can't think of a better choice."

Mr. Speaker, Justice Jackson's story is uniquely American and it's uniquely western New York. I will soon introduce legislation to name our new courthouse for Robert H. Jackson, and I invite my colleagues to join to support this effort.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, before spending last weekend in Hawaii and now jetting off to Australia and Indonesia, President Obama was crisscrossing our country on his "We Can't Wait" for Congress to act tour. Along the way, he found the time to issue Executive orders that circumvent the will of Congress. His justification for this end run around Congress? America can't wait for Congress to act to create jobs.

If our President was really interested in creating jobs, he would not have caved in to election-year politics, which was precisely what he did last Friday when he punted on approval of the proposed Keystone XL pipeline until well after next fall's election.

When completed, the Keystone XL pipeline will bring nearly 1 million barrels of oil per day to the United States from Canada. Support for this pipeline is wide and varied, including major United States labor unions who understand the project will create thousands of American jobs and reduce our reliance on Middle Eastern oil. We will have greater energy security, which means greater national security. That's a win-win-win-win for America.

There is no dispute that building the pipeline will create 20,000 direct American construction jobs and spin off over 100,000 indirect jobs in the good 'ol USA. Unfortunately, the President is putting personal political needs before the needs of out-of-work Americans. He is blowing an opportunity to ensure a stable energy supply from a country that likes us while creating jobs right here in America.

The Environmental Protection Agency and the State Department have spent extensive time reviewing the impact of this pipeline. Early proposals were revised to address EPA and stakeholder concerns. After years of study, a decision was supposed to be made this fall by President Obama. Apparently, it was a tough decision for our President. He had to choose between two groups within his political base—labor unions and jobs or environmental activists and no jobs.

There are times when the American people expect leadership, leadership which requires making tough decisions. Regrettably, last Friday, our President caved in to environmental and Hollywood activists as they surrounded the White House in opposition to the Keystone pipeline. He chose to postpone a final decision on the Keystone XL pipeline until January 2013. His reason? The administration needed to consider alternative routes for the pipeline that avoided aquifers in Nebraska.

But the saga doesn't end there. Yesterday, TransCanada, the builder of the pipeline, directly addressed President Obama's concerns by announcing they would reroute the pipeline to avoid the Nebraska aquifers. Problem solved. American people win; right? No. It took a few hours for the administration to announce that the goalposts were being moved again. Despite proposing a solution to the President's concerns, the administration announced that a final decision would not come until after the Presidential election in 2012. The bottom line: Presidential politics trumped what's best for a nation struggling to recover from the worst recession in history.

America needs a thoughtful leader who places the needs of country over politics. Canada has an abundance of energy they want to sell us, but they won't wait forever, and China is a ready customer. Canadian Prime Minister Harper recently indicated that with this unnecessary delay, Canada must increase its efforts to find a partner to ensure it can supply energy outside the United States and into Asia in particular.

This pipeline will help American families today. We need these jobs today. We need this pipeline today.

□ 1040

The Chicago Bears need a punter. The American people need a leader. President Obama should be that leader and approve this pipeline today.

RESTORING OUR ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, in the waning months of the Clinton administration, Jason Seligman, a government economist, produced a memo for the White House that speculated on what the effects would be if the United States paid off its national debt by 2012, as many were predicting at the time.

The memo, which was obtained by NPR under the Freedom of Information Act, was never released publicly, and the events of the intervening years have rendered it nothing more than an historical curiosity, but its mere existence is both a stark reminder of what might have been, and an acknowledgment that the great majority of the current debt was built up during the last administration.

In late 2000 no one could have foreseen the 9/11 attacks or the wars that would follow. These certainly contributed to the red ink. But profligacy, poor strategic choices, and political positioning are the real drivers of our burgeoning budget, which was under \$6 trillion at the time of President Clinton leaving office but is now nearly \$15 trillion.

Add in a real estate bubble fueled by too easy credit and an economy that was no longer focused on creating and making things here in America, and the challenge facing us comes into even more clear focus.

In one week, the bicameral supercommittee is due to present its plan to Congress to rein in our out-of-control finances and restore the responsible stewardship of our economy that prevailed at the end of the Clinton administration, when government ran surpluses for four straight years. A mere month after the supercommittee presents its plan, just before Christmas, we will either bless its work or face the real prospect of painful across-the-board cuts beginning in 2013.

I have long supported a realistic approach and urged the supercommittee to go big and consider the full range of government spending in making cuts. However, I also know that we cannot put our fiscal house in order solely through spending cuts, and that the government is going to have to find a way to increase the revenue flowing into the Federal Treasury.

While the choices we will confront in the next few weeks will be difficult, they're only the beginning of a process that must result in a new economic paradigm that will guide Congress and the administration in the coming years, when we'll be forced to adjust to a much more competitive global environment even as we work to put the economic downturn of the past 3 years behind us.

As the current wave of pessimism surrounding the work of the supercommittee demonstrates, this will not be an easy task, nor will it be accomplished quickly. If we are to succeed, and success is an absolute imperative, I believe that we'll need a new set of long-term strategies and policies to accomplish five principles.

First, the U.S. is going to have to become a manufacturer again. We should be proud that many of the world's iconic consumer products, like Apple iPhones, for example, were designed and developed here. But much of the benefit to our economy is lost because these products are too often manufactured overseas. American workers are not benefiting from the manufacture of Apple's category-leading smartphone.

We need to return to an economy where American workers are involved in the full life cycle of a product, from concept, through design and testing, and on to manufacture and marketing. To do that, I believe that we need to inject some certainty into our corporate tax structure, as well as create

a regulatory structure that protects workers, consumers, and the environment, but not in a way that is arbitrary or capricious.

Second, we need to ensure that small business remains the catalyst for the American economy. Capitalism, by its very nature, is highly competitive, and most new businesses fail. While government cannot change that central truth about a market economy, we can foster a climate that makes it easier to succeed by ensuring access to capital, targeted tax incentives, by creating a supportive infrastructure, and devising a regulatory framework that offers American business the best chance of success.

Third, we're in a global war for talent, and we must reorient our immigration structure to attract the most promising people from around the world. It is no longer a given that a young Indian or Chinese entrepreneur will want to move to the U.S. if given the chance. Combined with the disquieting trend that American universities are not producing enough homegrown talent in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, we face a daunting challenge. In coming days, I'll be introducing legislation that will make it easier for foreign-born graduates in select STEM fields to stay in this country by starting a new business here and hiring American workers.

Fourth, America cannot compete with the developing world in terms of wages, but a highly skilled work force, buttressed by a revitalized world class infrastructure that reduces the time and expense of getting goods to market and fosters innovation, will keep us competitive. That's why I support investments in infrastructure and education that will lay the groundwork for a newly competitive America while addressing the current unemployment problem acting as a drag on our economy.

Working together on these objectives, we can restore the middle class dream that hard work and perseverance will give the average American the chance to live comfortably. As President Clinton once observed, there's nothing wrong with America that cannot be cured by what is right with America.

NATIONAL ADOPTION WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, thank you for the time to talk about something near and dear to my heart, families.

This week is National Adoption Week, and as adoptive parents of two wonderful boys, my wife, Cathy, and I know how blessed an adoptive family is. Will, our 13-year old, and Sean, who will tell you he's almost 10, are the light of our lives. They're the gifts that give our lives a purpose and a joy we never knew before.

It's a privilege for me to serve the people of the Eighth District of Texas, but it is my highest privilege to be called Dad because two women in two difficult circumstances in two different States made the difficult but life-changing choice to give Cathy and I the greatest gift of all, a family.

This weekend marks the 12th annual National Adoption Day, where judges will open their courts for very special cases, and tens of thousands of children become a part of these forever families.

In my home State of Texas, there are nearly 30,000 children in foster care, and half of them could be adopted tomorrow. I hope that every American who has ever thought about sharing their blessings with a child thinks about these children who just want a seat at a Thanksgiving table they can call their own.

I ask every American, do you have room for one more at your table? If just 1 in 500 of the Americans who were polled recently and said they'd be open to adopting a foster child did so, no foster child would only have dreams of a forever family; they would have that seat at the Thanksgiving Day table.

Right now the average wait for a foster child to find a forever family is over 2½ years. To a child, that seems like forever. And thousands age out of the system every year, never having found a home. In the greatest Nation on God's green earth, we can do better by these kids, one by one, town by town.

A loving, forever family and home not only makes a powerful difference in the lives of these children, I can promise you the joy and love you'll get back will change your family. Being an adoptive parent is a gift. Every day is a present. The love you share comes back to you because adoptions make families. It made mine. Maybe it can make yours as well.

HOME BIRTH CONSENSUS SUMMIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize an event of critical importance to all current and future childbearing families in this country.

For 3 days in October, a national summit of maternity care stakeholders met in Warrenton, Virginia, to discuss the status of home birth within the greater context of maternity care in the United States. That meeting marked the first time a multidisciplinary group of maternity care providers, consumers, and industry leaders came together to determine what the U.S. maternity care system could do to make home birth the safest and most positive experience possible for moms and babies.

Given the significant controversy over the appropriateness of home birth within the groups represented at the summit, the fact that this conversa-

tion took place at all is historic. The goal of the meeting was not to debate the rightness or wrongness of home birth, but rather to discuss the support, care, consultation, collaboration, and referrals necessary to protect moms and babies in all birth settings.

According to CDC's most recent figures, in 2008, approximately 28,500 home births took place in the United States. While this number represents less than 1 percent of all births in our country, the last available statistics tell us that between 2004 and 2008, the number of women giving birth at home increased by 22 percent.

□ 1050

Without compromising quality of care, women want and expect to have choices for childbirth, including birth setting. Women and families are ill-served when maternity care professionals allow conflict between disciplines to supersede collaboration. The safety of birth in all settings must be the utmost priority.

The delegates who met in Virginia were charged with finding common ground to move the issue of safe home birth beyond professional differences and toward consensus building. The result of their effort was a consensus document released on November 1 of this year. This important document sets out nine essential statements of agreement about the ideal system to promote the safest and most positive birth outcomes across all birth settings.

While I will be submitting the entire document into the RECORD, I want to highlight the following key points agreed upon by all of the delegates at the summit:

First, all childbearing women in all maternity care settings should receive respectful, women-centered care, including opportunities for shared decisionmaking to help each woman make the choices that are right for her;

Second, physiological birth is valuable for women, babies, families, and society, and appropriate intervention should be based on the best available evidence to achieve optimal outcomes for mothers and babies;

Third, collaboration within an integrated maternity care system is essential for optimal outcomes, and when necessary, all women and families planning a birth center or home birth have a right to a respectful, safe, and seamless consultation, referral, transport, and transfer of care;

Fourth, all health professionals who provide maternity care in all settings should have a license that is based on national certification that includes defined competencies and standards for education and practice; and

Fifth, in order to foster effective communication and collaboration across all maternity disciplines, all students and practitioners involved in maternity and newborn care must learn about each other's disciplines and maternity care in all settings.

Additionally, the consensus document calls for medical liability system